

REMARKS

Claims 36, 38, 39, and 41 are pending in the subject application.

Applicants have amended claims 36 and 39, and have canceled claims 37 and 40. The changes to the claims made herein do not introduce any new matter.

Rejection Under 35 U.S.C. § 103

Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of the rejection of claims 36-41 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Tamura et al.* (“*Tamura*”) (US 6,806,978 B1) in view of *Hannah* (US 5,784,581) (as noted above, claims 37 and 40 have been canceled). As will be explained in more detail below, the combination of *Tamura* in view of *Hannah* would not have rendered the subject matter defined in independent claims 36 and 39, as amended herein, obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art.

Applicants have amended independent claim 36 to include the features specified in claim 37. Applicants have amended independent claim 39 to include the features specified in claim 40. In light of the changes to independent claims 36 and 39, Applicants have canceled claims 37 and 40.

In support of the obviousness rejection, the Examiner asserts that the *Tamura* reference discloses the features specified in claims 37 and 40 at column 31, lines 9-11 (see the Final Office Action at pages 3 and 5). As noted above, the features specified in claims 37 and 40 have been incorporated into independent claims 36 and 39, respectively. In the *Tamura* reference, when the camera section 110 is connected to the print section 150, power is supplied from the print section 150 to the camera section 110 through the USB interface, and when power is supplied from the print section 150 to the camera section 110, the USB I/F section detects that the connection is conducted through the USB (see column 31, lines 4-14). This same sequence is also adopted in the case where the camera section 110 is connected to the personal computer (PC) (see column 31, lines 61-67). Thus, in the *Tamura* reference, the

camera section 110 is powered on when the camera section 110 is connected to either the print section 150 or the PC.

Independent claims 36 and 39, as amended herein, specify that a controller is operable to change the connection mode in accordance with a condition of the digital camera, which includes *a state in which the digital camera is powered off*. The *Tamura* reference does not disclose that the camera section is powered off. Further, in *Tamura*, when the camera section 110 is connected through the USB to the print section 150 or the PC, the camera section 110 is powered on. Thus, for the camera section 110 to be in a powered off condition, the camera section 110 must not be connected to either the print section 150 or the PC. In other words, in *Tamura*, when the camera section 110 is powered off, the camera section 110 is not connected to either the print section 150 or the PC through the USB interface.

Each of present claims 36 and 39 specifies that a digital camera is connected to a USB interface in a connection mode. For at least the foregoing reasons, the *Tamura* reference does not disclose or suggest this aspect of the presently claimed subject matter.

In further support of the obviousness rejection, the Examiner asserts that the *Hannah* reference discloses the second connection mode in which the digital camera is in communication with a computer without the interrupt channel. However, since *Tamura's* camera section 110 is not connected in the powered off condition and *Tamura* does not disclose the claimed connection mode, one having ordinary skill in the art would not have been motivated to combine the second mode disclosed in *Hannah* with *Tamura's* camera section 110.

As such, the combination of the *Tamura* and *Hannah* references is improper because one having ordinary skill in the art would not have combined the references in the manner proposed by the Examiner. Nevertheless, even if the *Tamura* and *Hannah* references were to be combined in the manner proposed by the Examiner, the result of this combination would not have included each and every feature of the presently claimed subject matter for at least

the reasons set forth above. As such, the combination of the *Tamura* and *Hannah* references would not have rendered the presently claimed subject matter obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art.

Accordingly, independent claims 36 and 39, as amended herein, are patentable under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over the combination of *Tamura* in view of *Hannah*. Claim 38, which depends from claim 36, and claim 41, which depends from claim 39, are likewise patentable under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over the combination of *Tamura* in view of *Hannah* for at least the same reasons set forth above with regard to the independent claims.

Conclusion

In view of the foregoing, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and reexamination of claims 36, 38, 39, and 41, as amended herein, and submit that these claims are in condition for allowance. Accordingly, issuance of a notice of allowance is respectfully requested. In the event a telephone conversation would expedite the prosecution of this application, the Examiner may reach the undersigned at (408) 749-6902. If any fees are due in connection with the filing of this paper, then the Commissioner is authorized to charge such fees to Deposit Account No. 50-0805 (Order No. NGBCP007).

Respectfully submitted,
MARTINE PENILLA & GENCARELLA, LLP

/Peter B. Martine/

Peter B. Martine
Registration No. 32,043

710 Lakeway Drive, Suite 200
Sunnyvale, California 94085
Customer No. 25920